International Journal of Education and Language Studies
ISSN: 2791-9323

Research Article | June 2023 | Volume: 4 | Issue: 2

EFFECT OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN PROMOTING READING AND WRITING SKILLS IN SECOND YEAR SUDANESE EFL STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF KHARTOUM

Anwar M. HASSABALLA [1]

Elsadig Yahia EZZA [2]

Istanbul / Türkiye
p. 1-29

Received: 12/04/2023
Accepted: 13/05/2023
Published: 01/06/2023

This article has been scanned by **iThenticat** No **plagiarism** detected

Abstract:

The study aims to investigate the effect of cooperative learning in promoting reading and writing skills in second year Sudanese EFL students at University of Khartoum. The researchers used quasi experimental and analytical descriptive approaches. The subjects of the study were (43) students representing the second year of English department in the academic year (2017-2018). The treatment was done within two phases. In phase (1) the class divided into two groups; 22 students representing the experimental group and another (21) students as a control group in reading comprehension. In phase (2) the two groups were reversed the control group became experimental and the experimental group became control group in writing skill. Pre and post tests were conducted to both groups in the two phases of the treatment. After the treatment, a random group of (27) students were selected to respond to attitudes questionnaire. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between the students who taught with cooperative learning and those who were being taught by the traditional whole class- method in both reading and writing skills. Additionally, the high achiever students (high GPA), gain most from cooperative learning in writing skill and more importantly, the majority of second year students have positive attitudes towards cooperative learning. Based on these results, several theoretical and pedagogical implications are provided.

Key Words: Cooperative Learning Students' Achievement -English Language Proficiency.

http://dx.doi.org/10.47832/2791-9323.2-4.1

[1] Dr, University of Khartoum, Sudan. anwar.hassaballa@uofk.edu

[2] Prof. Dr, University of Khartoum, Sudan. elsadigezza@gmail.com

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

1. INTRODUCTION :

One of the greatest and inevitable challenges educators face is determining the most effective teaching strategies for their students. Understanding and assessing student involvement in learning can help teachers design the most effective curriculum and determine how student's best learn.

There are many researches that attempt to study the impact of different approaches to general education on student development using a large sample of undergraduate institutions and a wide range of student outcomes. Astin (1991) for example, was primarily interested in the outcomes and in particular how they are affected by environments. Eighty-eight environmental factors were investigated to determine which factors influenced students' academic achievement, personal development, and satisfaction with school. Astin found that the particular manner in which the general education curriculum is structured makes very little differences for most of the 22 outcomes. Instead, Astin found that two environmental factors were, by far, most predictive of positive change. These two factors, interaction among students and interaction between faculty and students, carried by far the largest weight and affected more general education outcomes than any other environmental variables studied, including the curriculum content factors. Student – student interaction produced significant the 22 outcomes and student – faculty interaction produced 17 outcomes. These findings suggest that educators should focus less on formal structure and content and put much more emphasis on pedagogy and other features of the delivery system, as well as on the broader interpersonal and institutional context in which learning takes place.

Hence Cooperative learning is widely recognized as a pedagogical practice that promotes socialization and learning among students from pre-school through to tertiary level and across different subject domains. It involves students working together to achieve common goals or complete group tasks – goals and tasks that they would be unable to complete by themselves. Cooperative learning has been found to better promote students' learning and social relations rather than the more traditional whole-class methods of teaching (Cohen 1994 b; Johnson and Johnson 1989; Slavin 1995; Veenman et al. 2000). Cooperative learning has been proven to create an atmosphere of academic achievement and to be effective in classroom environments (Johnson and Johnson 1993). Education research has emphasized that when students are actively involved in cooperative activities, they tend to learn best and more of what is taught; retain it longer than conventional teaching.

Applying cooperative learning (CL) to classroom teaching first started in the1970s when the United States began to study and design cooperative models for classroom context (Kessler, 1992). Then it found its way to most colleges and universities all over the world (Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Kessler, 1992), as both pedagogy and a learning strategy, and is claimed to be an effective teaching method in ESL/EFL Classrooms. Research on cooperative learning over the past three decades has documented academic and social benefits that students derive when they work together (Gillies, 2011; Gillies & Boyle, 2011; Johnson & Johnson, 2003, 2007;Sharan, 1994; Slavin, 1995).When students work together in small groups to achieve shared goals it is called cooperative learning. Previous research has shown that when cooperative learning is compared to individual learning, students who learn cooperatively obtain better academic results. Similarly, when it is compared to lecture directed learning, students also obtain better academic results (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). The other benefits of cooperative learning include enhanced thinking skills, more self-motivation to learn, higher self-esteem, greater respect for others and improved attitudes towards learning (Slavin, 1995)

It also has been found in research that summary writing can enhance reading and writing skills (Hoye, 1989, Karnes,1990: Sriratampai, 1999: Vasupen,1996,Ekwat, 2010) which are important for language students. The ability to write an effective summary is said

to be the most important writing skill a university student may possess, and university students need to be able to summarize before they can successfully produce other kinds of writing (Jamieson, 1999).summary writing prompts students to focus on specific items of information and leads the students to presents their ideas carefully (Langer and Applebee, 1987, Zhou and Siriyothin, 2008). Besides a number of research studies were conducted on summary writing to prove the hypothesis that students had better reading comprehension after learning to summarize (Honnert and Bozan, 2005: Vasupen, 1996,: Zhou and Siriyothin, 2008) or that they had improvements in other academic engagements (Edward & Chard, 2000) However summary writing is not an easy task. Kirkland and Saunders, 1991, p.108) state that to summarize a text effectively, the students must have adequate reading skills, comprehension, control of grammar, vocabulary and writing skills in order to restate the information accurately. The fact that English as a foreign language (EFL) students find it difficult to write adequate summaries is therefore not surprising.

To state briefly, summary writing is a study skill that enhances reading and writing abilities, prompting students to focus on specific information, and leading them to present their ideas carefully. However, because summary writing involves other language skills, there are problems that need to be addressed in learning to summarize. EFL students were found to be unable to restate the main ideas of the text, to commit plagiarism and to distort the original information, and to use source texts mostly without citing references or acknowledgement.

Unsystematic observation by the researchers over many years' teaching EFL students at university of Khartoum often done by whole class method (lectures) and instructors are influenced by grammar translation method since it has been still used from schooling in all stages.. According to Assalahi (2013), some teachers are unwilling to change their traditional method of teaching. They fail to incorporate different teaching strategies to develop social and linguistic skills in adult learners given under their charge. According to Javid, Farooq, and Gulzar (2012), some teachers either do not know

or they do not bother to use different and innovative instructional techniques. Abdel Rauf (2010), Rashed Alghamdi1 & Robyn Gillies: 2013) argues that Grammar Translation Method (GTM) dominates the Arab world and there is a need to investigate new approaches like CL in teaching English to adult learners. As a result, little opportunity is left for students to be actively involved in co-constructing the meaning of texts. The pedagogical approach is in part determined by the large class sizes (40 to 100) students) in both high schools and universities, which make it very difficult for teachers to cater for the different needs of individual students or involve them in classroom activities. Furthermore, most students have not been taught how to assume responsibility for their own learning; they tend to remain dependent on their teachers with regard to the meaning of the reading texts hence this is affect their ability to write well . In these circumstances, many of the students do not develop sufficient interest or motivation to become independent readers.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Cooperative Learning and Writing

Writing is one of skills that students need to master. Students‟ acquisition of the writing skills is given much emphasis in the educational system. However, Grabe & Kaplan (1996) state that writing process received relatively little attention in research on foreign language teaching. Yet it is a valuable communicative skill to convey a person's thoughts and feelings. It is also a mean of self-discovery and linguistic discipline.

Harmer (2006) believes that writing in groups is effective in genre-based and process approach. Students found the activity motivating in terms of the writing itself. They also found the activity to be motivating when they embark on the research, discussed on the topics, had peer evaluation and achieved the group's goal.

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

Data attained from ten limited English proficient (LEP) community college students who were taught largely using cooperative learning approaches also showed positive outcome (Jones & Carrasquillo 1998). For four months, the students worked together using brainstorming techniques and collaborative reading and writing tasks. Results indicated that the cooperative learning approach improved the students writing skills.

2.2 The relationship between writing & reading

Although writing is a productive skill and reading is a receptive one, it is important to make the distinction about how much can be learned about writing from reading. Reading tends to be the essential source of knowledge about writing (Stocky (1983: 636). Therefore, reading complements writing. This reveals that the two skills are tight in a complementary way; in addition, good reading polishes and frames our writing to make it better and richer.

According to Nelson (1993: 328), a reading-writing approach assumes that "reading and writing are inextricably and reflectively connected, that a written text is a reading text, that we read to write and write to read, and that reading and writing are similar processes of making meaning" Kucer (2005: 191) states that "the relationship between reading and writing is that of parallel or complementary processes". Each process has an implicit power to impact and stimulate growth in the other. Therefore, reading serves writing and leads to its maturity. The more writers read, the better their writing will be. Writing feeds on reading, and its life cycle is more reliant on it. The interdependent relationship between reading and writing offers us the basic idea that combining these two skills is of paramount significance for learner's cognitive capacities, and that instruction which incorporates writing and reading together enhances students' ability to transfer knowledge acquired in one context to a new one. Interestingly these views match with cooperative learning methods. For instance, in collaborative strategy reading (CSR) which is a combination of reciprocal teaching strategy and cooperative learning group activity or student pairing, the focus on (reading and writing) and cooperative integrated reading & composition (CIRC) as well. The latter, students work on materials appropriate to their level. In pairs, within their groups, students work on cognitively encaging activities (e.g.; reading to one another, summarizing stories to one another, practicing spelling ...etc.). Then they work with group members to master comprehension skills. Students later they engaged with a writer's workshop, (I e, writing drafts, revising and editing one another's' work .... etc.). On the other hand, writing skill, when incorporated multi use of structures such like, (think- pair-share), (think- pair- write), (show down), (Rally Robin), (Round table) and (Jot thought). This will enhance students to verbalize their ideas and receive immediate feedback and correction from the teacher or classmates during peer interaction. Thus they gain better understanding of the topic of writing and produce creative piece of writing as well. Therefore, instruction that involves reading and writing together becomes a priority in composing, developing and analyzing ideas. Consequently, instructors should integrate these two skills to enhance students' command of the disciplinary language.

2.3 Summary writing and reading comprehension

There is a strong connection between summary writing and reading comprehension as Wong (1981, p.19) states that summary writing is a test of comprehension; hence one cannot write a good summary of a source without understanding it. In other words, summary writing is a reading strategy that helps with comprehension of a source text.

Horner and Bozan (2005) discovered that teaching summarization as a reading strategy increased the students' abilities to (a) acquire and use information and (b) better comprehend science concepts. In combination with other vocabulary attainment activities, summary frames enhance students' ability to apply information to discussions, laboratory reports, and projects, proving that there was a strong connection between summarizing and reading comprehension. Summarizing is a highly complex process. EFL students are confronted with a number of issues pertaining to summarization. These are categorized as external or internal constraints. So the teachers in order to maximize student performance

in summary writing, external and internal constraints should be considered (Kirkland and Saunders, 1991, pp.105-104)

External constraints are factors such as the purpose and the audience of the assignment, features of the assignment itself, discourse community conventions, nature of the material to be summarized, time constraints, and the environment in which the EFL student must function. Internal constraints consist of L2 proficiency, content schemata, affect, formal schemata, cognitive skills and meta-cognitive skills, all of which are important. However, L2 proficiency seems to be fundamental to successful summarizing. EFL students, who are limited in the control of grammar, vocabulary, and writing skills, are unlikely to paraphrase or retain the original meanings of the source texts.

In short, EFL students have both external and internal constraints to encounter. While external factors such as types of the assignment , nature of the texts to be summarized , and time constraints can be maneuvered , it is internal constraints such as language proficiency, schemata and cognitive skills that the students often find overpowering. The teacher is therefore advised to limit the former constraints so as to allow the students to focus on developing their summarizing skills.

3. Statement of Problem

Despite the positive influence of cooperative learning (CL) in the academic achievement, many EFL university instructors neglect to use (CL) and little attention has been given to the relationship between CL strategy and students participation in language activities. In addition, many EFL teachers find difficulty in incorporating this system of instructional method in their classrooms. The researcher believes that reading and writing go together as speaking and listening although reading is perceptive skill and writing is productive one, but in particular, EFL learners find writing, most difficult skill in English language and that is due to the difficulties they face in reading comprehension. However, the problem of Sudanese EFL learners according to many researchers, can be traced back to the time that allotted to reading is not sufficient. Hence they never grasp the information in texts because they are often slow readers. Nevertheless, the existing weaknesses in reading influence their ability to write well. Cooperative learning, in terms of writing, emphasizes the experiential process in which students are exposed to each other's knowledge, ideas, opinions, disagreements, etc. As part of this process, students rethink and rephrase their thoughts and statements until the group concludes its deliberations. This opportunity for thinking and rethinking about one's ideas, and for expressing and rephrasing one's thoughts in conversation with peers, during reading comprehension or writing process is expected to assist students to develop greater understanding of the texts they read and write creative piece of writing by following the process approach.

4. The Significance of the study

Research and studies on cooperative learning in several countries have reported the positive effects of improving students' academic and social performance. However CL is not widely adopted by colleges and schools in Sudan. The research findings can shed light on the benefits of using CL and urge teachers and lecturer to use this technique. The significant of this study, provides quality modern teaching methods based on modern educational strategies (CL) for teaching and developing reading and writing skills in tertiary level. The study will reduce the existing weakness of EFL university students in both reading and writing skills and boost achievement. In addition, with cooperative learning, students will be acquainted with team work. In other words, we prepare them for future jobs. Overall the study is going to set out Cooperative Learning strategy that teachers of EFL learners can implement in their English Classes to teach reading and writing skills.

5. Objectives of the Study

• To boost achievement of EFL learners in both reading comprehension and writing skills in general in second year of English department – faculty of education –university of Khartoum in brief.
• To prepare students for the workplace of future - a workplace in which team work skills and communication skills, is in a high premium.
• To adopt gradually cooperative learning as Khartoum university's character development program that distinguish the university from other universities and make it as a leading university in the educational reform especially in teaching foreign languages.
• To set out cooperative learning strategy in teaching EFL learners reading and writing skills which help university teachers to teach EFL learners more effectively.

6. Research Questions

The discussions and interpretations of the data collected from the student's questionnaire & pre- and post-tests are organized for answering questions of the study and to validate the study four hypotheses in a scientific way.

The current study attempts to explore and answer the following research questions:
a. What is the effect of cooperative learning in comparison to traditional Whole- class method on the achievement of **reading comprehension & writing skill** of second year students of English department at faculty of education – university of Khartoum?

b. Is there a significant difference between students who taught English with cooperative learning (**the experimental group)** and those who taught by using the traditional whole – class method (**the control group**)?

c. Do high GPA students gain most in cooperative learning than low GPA students in writing skill?

d. What are the attitudes of Sudanese EFL second year students towards cooperative learning?

7. Research Hypotheses

The research questions lead to the following hypotheses:

1. Cooperative Learning (CL) is expected to achieve a positive effect in promoting reading comprehension and writing skills on Sudanese learners in higher education.
2. There will be significant differences on the achievement between students who are going to be taught English in the cooperative learning environment (The experimental group) and those who are going to be taught English by using the traditional whole class method
3. High Achiever students (High GPA) are gain most in Cooperative learning than low achiever (low GPA) students in writing skill.
4. Sudanese EFL undergraduate students are expected to have positive attitudes towards cooperative learning.

Two sets of analyses were done in the study including the reading comprehension and writing skill pre- and post-test, For the pre-test analysis, the researchers used a t-test to determine the differences between the two groups, if any. These tests were also used to establish the initial equivalence of the groups. For the post-test, the same methods of analysis were used to measure how effective the usage of such a method was. All in all, the analyses employed to asses, and derive results from the research data included the following:

a. Results of the t-test of the experimental & control groups in the pre- and post-test designed to measure reading comprehension and writing skill for Sudanese EFL second year university students.

b. Results of the paired samples t-test to investigate the difference in both reading comprehension and writing skill performance between the pre- and post-tests for the two groups.

c, Results of the paired samples t-test to investigate the difference in writing skill performance between the high GPA and low GPA students for cooperative learning group.

d., Percentages and Results of t-test one sample of students' responses to the questionnaire to investigate students' attitudes towards cooperative learning in English classrooms.

The results from each datum set are discussed in details in the following sections, and they are compared to other results discussed in the review of literature when appropriate.

8. Method

8.1. Participants

The population of this study was drawn exclusively from the students of English Department, Faculty of Education, - University of Khartoum. The sample was the student's of2rdyear at the University level who were (43 students). The researcher has chosen the students of 2nd year as a sample for this research because students in second year had at least built an amount of vocabulary that will enable them to respond to reading comprehension questions and writing a paragraph and making summary. The minimum sample size needed to detect the differences between experimental group score and control group score (with type I error at 5% and power at 80%) was based on the nonparametric test of Mann-Whitney which is 20 students per-group (Cohen, 1988, Sheskin, 2003). The researchers increased the sample to 22 to account for drop of participants or absence. The second tool for data collection was the students' attitudes questionnaire. The questionnaire of Likert 5-point scale (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree) was distributed to a random sample of (27) students from the second year after undergone the treatment to investigate their attitudes towards cooperative learning.

8.2. Instrumentation

The data related to this research was gathered by means of questionnaire & a pre and post-test. Mann-Whitney was used to test for the presence of statistically significant differences between the scores of the experimental group and control group. Likewise, t- test was used to test for presence of statistically significant differences between pre and post-test scores.

8.3.1 Pre and post Test for (Reading Comprehension)

Two Reading tests were conducted to the students which in the control group the students taught in a traditional whole class – method (lecture). On the other hand, Students in the experimental were divided into small groups using cooperative learning method with the purpose of making a comparison of how the students' performance is different in the pre and the post test.

The pre-test was conducted to the control group after using the regular ways of teaching which students are familiar with; while the post-test was conducted at the end of the experiment (i.e., after the students built background about cooperative learning and how it should be used). It was mainly used for measuring performance and evaluating the progress of the subjects in English reading. Yet, once the content of the course has two areas; reading and writing (E 2033 -Advanced Study Skills (1) For Reading and Writing) the researcher conducted two experiments; the first experiment which examined reading skill conducted in the first mid- term (six weeks) and the second experiment which examined writing skill conducted in the second mid- term of the first semester (six weeks).

8.3.2 Pre and Post Test for (Writing)

Two writing tests were conducted to the students after changing the roles between the two groups of students; the control group of reading in the first mid - term changed to experimental group of writing in the second mid – term and the experimental group of reading in the first mid - term changed to control group of writing in the second mid- term. The division and reverse of the two groups done due to the course content and the research itself, which examined two skills of English language (Reading & Writing) as mentioned before. Hopefully this has a positive side in terms of avoiding the researchers' bias for one group to another and being fair with the other group by giving them the chance to learn how to use cooperative learning structures.

The pre-test of writing was taken with pre-test of reading test at the beginning of the first semester in the academic year (2017-2018). This was conducted with the control group by using the traditional whole class method (lecture) while the post-test was conducted at the end of the experiment (i.e., after the students built background about cooperative learning and how it should be used). It was mainly used for measuring performance and evaluating the progress of the subjects in English writing.

8.4 Attitudes questionnaire

Another objective of the study was to figure out the students' attitudes on cooperative learning after providing cooperative learning intervention. Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S (1997:405) clarify that an attitude is often defined as a tendency to react favorably or unfavorably toward a designed class of stimuli such as a national or ethnic, group, a custom, or an institution when so defined; attitudes cannot be directly observed but must be inferred from overt behavior, both verbal and nonverbal. So, the second instrument was the questionnaire which was distributed to a random sample of (27) students of second year in English at the end the first semester. The questionnaire included a covering page to introduce the title of the research to the participants and to identify the researcher. The researcher also used Likert 5-point scale (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree).The questionnaire was designed to serve as a tool for gathering data about their attitudes on CL since it was the first time to exposed to such innovative approach. The questionnaire contained (27) statements built on the basis of the hypotheses of the research.

9. Procedure

The quantitative data on students score in implementing cooperative learning strategy for developing students' reading & writing skills tests were entered and processed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22 (Corp., 2013). The results obtained in the (4) tests and the students' questionnaires which after the treatment was analysed by an expert in SPSS program and relevant statistical measures were applied to arrive at accurate results.

10. Design

The current study used the quasi experimental and analytical descriptive approaches. The sample of the study was divided into two groups from second year of English department – faculty of education. Regarding the test which took place at university of Khartoum, the students were divided into two groups as control group which was taught through the conventional way of teaching (lecture) and the experimental group which was taught by implementing cooperative learning strategy. The pre and post-test were made with the purpose of making a comparison between the students' performance both in control group and experimental group.

The treatment consists of two phases: (1) phase 1: deals with reading comprehension, a pre-test, post-test with experimental and control groups were applied. The experimental group was taught through Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC), whereas

control group was taught through whole class - method which involves lecturing and question-response.

(2) Phase 2: deals with writing skill, a pretest, post –test with experimental and control groups were also applied. The experimental group was taught through cooperative learning in which the researchers have applied multi use of structures such like, (think- pair-share), (think- pair- write), (show down),(Rally Robin), (Round table) and (Jot thoughts), whereas control group was taught through traditional conventional way of teaching (lecture). The treatment which designed to measure reading comprehension and writing skill lasted within (12 weeks) in addition to one oriented week for each phase of the treatment. The experimental research model is shown on the following table.

Table (1)

Table (1): Experimental Research Model

Treatment	Duration	Groups	N	Pre -test	Experiments	Post-test
Phase 1	6 weeks	Experimental group	22	Reading Comprehension Achievement test	Cooperative learning	Reading Comprehension Achievement Test
		Control group	21		Traditional Teaching	
		Total	43			
Phase 2	6 weeks	Experimental group	21	Writing skill Achievement test	Cooperative learning	Writing skill Achievement test
		Control group	22		Traditional Teaching	
	12 weeks	Total	43			

11. Data Analysis

This part presented the analysis of pre and post-test for both control group and experimental group through the use of statistical t-test paired samples tests.

The first research question asks: **what** is the effect of cooperative learning in comparison to traditional Whole- class method on the achievement of **reading comprehension & writing skill** of second year students of English department?

To answer this question, one needs to compare the performance of students in both groups before and after the treatment. The pre-test was crucial in determining the initial equivalence between the cooperative learning group and the control (traditional) group

11.1 Testing students' achievement on (1) Reading Comprehension

In order to analyze the effects of cooperative learning method and traditional teaching methods on reading comprehension skills and achievements of the students learning English as a foreign language, first, Reading Comprehension Achievement Test were carried out both in experimental and control groups and then the differences were compared by an independent sample *t* test.

The following table illustrates this

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

Table (11.1.1)

T – test paired Sample (Pre- test)

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Experimental group	22	50.73	14.74	1.64	41	0.11	No difference
Control group	21	58.70	17.29				

To ensure the equality of both groups, the researcher used the independent samples *t* test. Results of Reading Comprehension pre-test (see Table 11.1.1) showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups. The mean score of the cooperative learning group (n = 22) was (50.73) with a standard deviation (SD) of (14.74), whereas the control group (n = 21) scored (58.70) with a SD of (17.29).

As shown in Table 8.1.1, the Sig. (2-tailed) was t value = 1.64, P= 0.11 and it is greater than (0.05); hence one can conclude that there was no significant difference in the mean scores for each of the two groups before carrying out the experiment. The results do not reveal significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups before the starting of the study.

In order to analyze the effects of cooperative learning method on reading comprehension skills and achievements of the students learning English as a foreign language, according to the Reading Comprehension Achievement Pre & Post-Test results of experimental and control groups were compared, their means scores, standard deviation scores were calculated and t-test was conducted.

The following table illustrates the progress of experimental group due to the application of cooperative learning in the experiment:

Table (11.1.2)

A Comparison of Pre and Post-test results of Reading Comprehension Achievement Test Scores of Experimental Group

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Pre test	22	50.73	14.74	4.07	41	0.001	There is difference
Post test	22	79.73	10.66				

Table (11.1.2**)** shows that the mean scores of post-test results (79.73) of cooperative learning group is higher than their pre-test scores (50.73). This indicates that the level of improvement was 29 degrees. In order to analyze the significance of the difference statistically, t-test was carried out and it shows that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of pre-test results of the cooperative learning group when it is compared with their reading comprehension achievement post-test scores. (sd=10.66, t-test=4.07, $p<.05$).

Table (11.1.3)

A Comparison of Pre and Post-test Results of Reading Comprehension Achievement Test Scores of Control Group

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Pre test	21	58.70	17.29	1.64	41	0.11	No difference
Post test	21	59.71	20.36				

Table (11.1.3) shows that the mean scores of post-test results (59.71) of traditional teaching group is very close to pre-test scores (58.70). In other words, they were at a similar level of achievement in this case. In order to analyze the significance of the difference statistically, t-test was carried out and it shows that there is no significant difference.

In order to analyze the effects of cooperative learning method on reading comprehension skills and achievements of the students learning English as a foreign language, according to the Reading Comprehension Achievement Post-Test results of cooperative learning and traditional teaching method groups, their means scores, standard deviation scores were calculated and t-test was conducted.

Table (11.1.4)

: **A Comparison of Reading Comprehension Achievement Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Groups**

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Experimental group	22	79.73	10.66	4.07	41	0.001	There is difference
Control group	21	59.71	20.36				

Table (11.1.4) shows the difference between reading comprehension achievement post-test scores of experimental and control groups. The mean score of the experimental group is 79.73, whereas the mean score of the control group is higher than 59.71. As results of the statistical 2-tailed t-test results, p value is lower than .05 and the t score is 4.07. The results show that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups and it was observed that cooperative learning method applied in experimental group has a higher effect on reading comprehension skills when compared with the effects of traditional teaching methods.

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

11.1 Testing students' achievement on (2) Writing skill

In order to determine the effectiveness of the experiment in writing skill the researcher used the independent samples *t* test. The following table illustrates this

Table (11.1.5)

T– test paired Sample (Pre- test)

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Experimental group	21	38.57	14.22	0.55	41	0.59	No difference
Control group	22	40.91	13.67				

To ensure the equality of both groups, the researcher used the independent samples *t* test. Results of Writing skill pre-test (see Table 11.1.5) showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups. The mean score of the cooperative learning group (n = 21) was (38.57) with a standard deviation (SD) of (14.22), whereas the control group (n = 22) scored (40.91) with a SD of (13.67).

As shown in Table 8.1.5, the Sig. (2-tailed) was t value = 0.55, P= 0.59 and it is greater than (0.05); hence one can conclude that there was no significant difference in the mean scores for each of the two groups before carrying out the experiment. The results do not reveal significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups before the starting of the study.

To investigate the gains that cooperative learning group made in their Writing skill test after undergoing the treatment, a t-test was applied to the scores of the group's writing skill test (pre and post-test.). The following table illustrates this

Table (11.1.6)

A Comparison of Pre and Post-test results of Writing skill Achievement Test Scores of Cooperative Learning Group

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Pre test	21	38.57	14.22	3.48	41	0.001	There is difference
Post test	21	71.14	14.18				

Table (11.1.6**)** shows that the mean scores of post-test results (71.14) of cooperative learning group is higher than their pre-test scores (38.57). This indicates that the level of improvement was over 32 degrees. In order to analyze the significance of the difference statistically, t-test was carried out and it shows that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of pre-test results of the cooperative learning group when it is compared with their Writing skill achievement post-test scores. (sd=14.18, t-test=3.48, p<.05).

Table (11.1.7)

A Comparison of Pre and Post-test Results of Writing skill Achievement Test Scores of Control Group

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Pre test	22	40.91	13.67	0.55	41	0.59	No difference
Post test	22	55.36	15.52				

Table (11.1.7) shows that the mean scores of post-test results (55.36) of traditional teaching group is higher than the pre-test scores (40.91). The level of improvement is less than 15 degrees. In order to analyze the significance of the difference statistically, t-test was carried out and it shows that there is a slight difference.

Although there is a slight improvement but, the Sig. (2-tailed) was t value = 0.55, P= 0.59and it is greater than (0.05); hence one can conclude that there was no significant difference in the mean scores for each of the two groups. The results do not reveal significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttest of the traditional group.

The consideration of this result, the researcher assume that concern this improvement, the traditional group was benefited much from cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC) since they were practicing reading texts or stories and summaries them to their teammates, writing composition and review sentence structure when they were experimental group in phase I – reading comprehension.

In order to investigate the effect of cooperative learning in promoting writing skill for Sudanese second year EFL students, after undergoing the treatment, a t-test was applied to the scores of writing skill test for both groups (pre and post-test.).

The following table illustrates this

Table (11.1.8)

A Comparison of Writing Skill Achievement Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Experimental group	21	71.14	14.18	3.48	41	0.001	There is difference
Control group	22	55.36	15.52				

The results indicated in table (11.1.8) showed that the experimental group's mean score was (71.14) with SD of (14.18) while the control group was (55.36) with SD of (15.52), and the t-value was (3.48). The variation between the two groups' mean scores indicates that the experimental group improved significantly in comparison to the control group.

The analysis, as shown in table (11.1.8), indicates a significant difference, favoring the cooperative learning group. Both means of measurement revealed that the sig (2-tailed) is less than (.01); therefore, the difference in Writing skill between the two groups is statistically significant. Based on this result, cooperative learning is an effective teaching and learning strategy in promoting Writing skill for Sudanese EFL university students.

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

11.2. Testing the difference on students' Achievement in Reading & Writing Skills

In order to find out the difference in Reading Comprehension and writing skill Post-Test results of cooperative learning and traditional teaching method groups, their means scores, standard deviation scores were calculated and t-test was conducted. As the second question asks: Is there a significant difference between students who taught English with cooperative learning (**the experimental group)** and those who taught by using the traditional whole –class method (**the control group**)?

To answer this question, one needs to compare the performance of students in both experimental and control groups in the two skills in their posttests.

The following table gives a clear image of the difference on students' achievement according the paired t test that has been applied.

Table (11.2.1)

A Comparison of Reading Comprehension & Writing skill Achievement Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Group

N= number, St. D = standard deviation, t= t value, df= degree of freedom, Sig. = significant

Test	Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Reading Comprehension	Experimental group	22	79.73	10.66	4.07	41	0.001	There is difference
	Control group	21	59.71	20.36				
Writing Skill	Experimental group	21	71.14	14.18	3.48	41	0.001	There is difference
	Control group	22	55.36	15.52				

Table (11.2.1) shows the difference between reading comprehension and writing skill achievement post-test scores of experimental and control groups. In reading comprehension test as presented, the mean score of the experimental group is 79.73, whereas the mean score of the control group is higher than 59.71. As results of the statistical 2-tailed t-test results, p value is lower than .05 and the t score is 4.07. The results show that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups and it was observed that cooperative learning method applied in experimental group has a higher effect on reading comprehension skills when compared with the effects of traditional teaching methods

On the other hand, in writing skill test, the results have showed that the CLL group's mean score was (71.14) with SD of (14.18) while the traditional group was (55.36) with SD of (15.52), and the t-value was (3.48). The variation between the two groups' mean scores indicates that the CLL group improved significantly in comparison to the control group.

It is clear that, there is a significant difference, favoring the cooperative learning group. And that is because, both means of measurement revealed that the sig (2-tailed) is less than (.01); therefore, the difference in Writing skill between the two groups is statistically significant. Based on these results, cooperative learning is an effective teaching and learning strategy in promoting Reading comprehension and Writing skill for Sudanese EFL university students.

11.3. Testing Cooperative Learning gains on Academic Achievement

This section concerns the scores of (21) students in the experimental group of writing skill for one class in pre and posttests to identify the growth from pretest to posttest then to find out the effect of CL on high/Low GPA students.

The third research question asks, do high GPA (high achiever) students gain most in cooperative learning than low GPA students in writing skill?

To answer this question, a comparison should be made between the scores of high GPA and low GPA students obtained after caring out the treatment in writing skill.

To investigate the gains of cooperative learning on the two groups (high and low GPA) of students in their Writing skill test after undergoing the treatment, a t-test was applied to the scores of the groups of the post-test.

Table (11.3.1)

T – test paired Sample (Writing skill) Experimental group

Group	N	Mean	St. D	t	df	Sig.	Results
Low GPA	10	60.60	11.95	4.608	41	0.001	There is difference
High CPA	11	80.73	7.84				

To investigate the effect of CL on high & low GPA students, the researcher used the independent paired samples *t* test. Results of writing skill post -test (see Table 11.3.1) showed that there was significant difference between the two groups. The mean score of the high GPA group's (n = 11) was (80.73) with a standard deviation (SD) of (7.84), whereas the low GPA group (n = 10) scored (60.60) with a SD of (11.95).

As shown in Table 11.3.1 the Sig. (2-tailed) was t value = 4.608, P= 0.001and it is less than (0.05); hence the analysis indicates a significant difference, favoring the high GPA. Therefore, the difference in writing skill between the two groups is statistically significant. Based on this result, the high GPA. Students gain most from cooperative learning in writing skill. (Please see appendix A page 24-27)

11.4. Testing Students' attitudes

The fourth research question asks:

4. *What are the attitudes of Sudanese EFL second year students towards cooperative learning*?

To answer this question, the researcher used the five-point Likert questionnaire to gather data. The 27-items questionnaire was administered to (27) participants selected randomly from second year at the end of the semester to explore their attitudes towards cooperative learning used during the experiment

Each questionnaire item consists of a five-point rating scale and coded as follows: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = Agree, 3= Neutral, 2 = Disagree and 1 = strongly disagree.

The range was calculated for the scale where the range = 5-1=4. By dividing the range by the number of categories (5), the result would be 4/5= 0.80 which represented the length of each category of the five scales. Then the length of the category was added to the lowest grade of the scale which is the number (1). So the first category was (1+.80= 1. 80) (Dörnyei, 2003, P 96). This process was applied to the rest of the categories (see Table 8-4).

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

Table (11-4) *Range of scale used for analyzing the results of the questionnaire*

Strongly disagree	**1,00- 1.80**
Disagree	**> 1.81 to 2.60**
Neutral	**> 2.61 to 3.40**
Agree	**>3.41 to 4.20**
Strongly agree	**> 4.21 to 5.00**

In order to statistically analyzed student's attitudes questionnaire, the researcher used the independent t- test for one sample group. The table (11-4-1) has been provided in the appendix as Wolfe (2011) cited in Swale & Feak (2012) that in many disciplines, the data is displayed in a table, graph, figure, or some other kind of non-verbal illustration. The data may come from a source, or it may be the outcome of your own work – that is, your results. This data is likely incorporated in the main text, although in some cases it may be provided in an appendix. The researcher has reported a data commentary for table (8-4-1) in the following highlighting statements.

Highlighting Statements of table (11-4-1)

Table (8-4-1) shows second year students responses to Likert' 5 points scale questionnaire measured by a t test one sample to investigate their attitudes towards cooperative learning. As can be seen from the table, over third of the statements has showed strongly agreement responses and their mean scores were varied between (4.20) and (4.70) whereas the rest of the other statements have showed agreement responses and their mean scores were distributed between (3.65) and (4.19). Statement (one, four, five, six, seven twelve, thirteen, fourteen, seventeen and eighteen) were showed strongly agreement responses and ranked from first up to seventh whereas the other seventeen statements were showed agreement responses and ranked from eighth up to eighteenth. From the table it is clearly that statement no.1 ranked first and it showed the highest mean score reached to (4.69) whereas the lowest mean score was (3.66) recorded by the third statement. This means that all the mean scores of the statements were over the average and scored more than (3.40) which indicate that the respondents have appositive attitudes towards cooperative learning.

To calculate the percentage of the questionnaire responses, first, the mean score of each statement is compared to the scale measure provided in Table (11-4-1) in the appendix (B)Page 28 then, the number of statements that indicate general agreement are added together and divided by the number of statements the questionnaire had, multiplied by 100. The same thing is done to neuter and general disagreement statements.

By doing so, it can be seen that 82.63% of the subjects agreed that they have positive attitudes towards cooperative learning.

12. Discussion

Firstly, considering the results of the present study, it is obvious that cooperative learning is more effective in improving reading and writing skills for Sudanese EFL learners when compared with traditional teaching methods.

This finding of the present study support the findings of various other studies carried out through reading comprehension and writing skill via cooperative learning both nationally and internationally.

The result confirms the effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in promoting reading comprehension which is consistent with Sittilert (1994) findings as he reported that, the findings of the posttest of reading showed that the learners in the experimental group were better in terms of reading comprehension and overall their perception of the techniques were also positive.

Many studies (e.g., Law, 2011; Liao & Oescher, 2009; Suh, 2009) have showed the usefulness of the application of cooperative learning on reading comprehension. Some studies have showed that the application of cooperative techniques provides the learners with more opportunities to engage in interaction with each other, resulting in better gains with regards to reading and decreasing the level of anxiety (Gillies & Ashman, 2000) consequently, cooperative learning is effective teaching and learning strategy in promoting Writing skill for Sudanese EFL university students. This result indicates that the cooperative learning approach improved the students writing skills. However, this is a congruent with (Jones & Carrasquillo 1998) who reported that students who were taught largely using cooperative learning approaches showed positive outcome.

Mariam and Napisah (2005) also postulated that when peer interaction was incorporated in learning writing, the students generated ideas and constructed sentences together. Thus this will lead to a better understanding of the topic that they are required to write on. The students will also be able to write concrete, accurate and creative piece of writing (Mariam & Napisah 2005) Collaborative work between learners is encouraged to increase motivation and develop positive attitudes towards the writing activities (Nunan 1991; Spencer 1983). The students should be responsible in their writing and given the opportunity to share their works with others. The immediate feedback and positive reinforcement will boost their motivation to engage in writing activities. The studies conducted on the incorporation of cooperative learning in learning writing, showed that cooperative learning is an effective educational approach to improve the students" achievement in writing.

Secondly, the interpretation of the difference on academic achievement between cooperative classroom and traditional classroom can be better explained by peer interaction and immediate feedback that students receive from their teammates or the teacher while they are doing the tasks or solving a problem For instance, Kagan (1994) has reported that, in the traditional classroom, students work alone and turn in their papers for the teacher to grade. Students do not get their marked papers returned until after a substantial delay. This means that a student can practice the whole worksheet wrong, think they are doing well, expect a good mark, and feel devastated when they get back a poor grade. The traditional mode is summative, outcome-oriented—only *after* doing problems do students find out if they are doing them correctly? In contrast, cooperative learning structures provide formative feedback. They are process-oriented—students get feedback *while* they are doing problems. Because correction opportunities occur while students are doing each problem.

Practicing wrong and forming misconceptions and bad habits are much less likely. This immediate, process-oriented, formative feedback is most important especially in promoting students reading comprehension & writing skill. And it is present in many structures for knowledge building, procedure learning, and processing information such as Rally Coach, Pairs Check, Sage-N Scribe, Numbered Heads Together, Showdown, Round Table Consensus, and listen Right.

This is congruent with Stevens (2003) who noted that the support students receive while in their working groups effectively supports their reading, comprehension, and vocabulary, while promoting reading and writing achievements.

McGroarty (1993) also argued that: By providing a variety of ways to expose students to academic content and creating different situations in which they experience and discuss curriculum content, cooperative learning serves both language and content curriculum goals. Through cooperative learning there is improved comprehension and production of language, and both these outcomes aid attainment of subject matter goals. (p. 47)

Both Johnson (2001) and Leal (1993) reported gains in academic achievement as a result of implementation of cooperative learning strategies with writing and reading.

Bromley and Modlo (1997) maintained that various models of cooperative learning instruction can help students to be successful in school as well as prepare them for careers in the real world. They reported that students felt good about being within cooperative learning groups.

Nesbit and Rogers found that cooperative learning strategies did not simply enrich reading and writing abilities of students, but that their problem-solving abilities emerged as well. Some of the strategies included group rewards while others did not adequate teacher training was identified as the key to success (Stevens (2003).

Kagan also has added that, Cooperative Learning transforms the dynamics of correction opportunities similar to how it transforms the dynamics of reinforcement. In cooperative learning, correction is immediate, frequent, more equal, peer-based, and supportive rather than evaluative.

According to Kagan views feedback in cooperative class is differ from traditional classroom. This is because many students are more open to feedback from a peer than feedback from the teacher. Sometimes peers can explain to a fellow student in ways the student can better understand. When students receive corrections from the teacher on a worksheet after completing the worksheet, they perceive the feedback as evaluative rather than helpful. The corrections are seen as *grading,* not an attempt to teach or help the student.

In contrast, peer feedback during cooperative learning is seen as *support*. The worksheet is seen as an opportunity to improve learning—not a tool for evaluation. When students receive grades after completing a task, the tendency is to ask, “Did I get my A?” or “Did I pass?” The bottom-line focus is not on learning, but on grade. When students receive feedback during the task from a teammate who is helping them succeed, they feel supported rather than evaluated; the focus is on learning. We become a community of learners.

Thirdly, regarding the finding of CL gains it was compatible with the theory of the Learning Pyramid. The high achievers in the experimental group spent considerable amount of time working with the low-achievers in the same group, which meant that the high achievers needed to explain ideas to their group members to enhance understanding and learning. By teaching their teammates, the high achievers benefited just as much as the low-achievers. According to the Learning Pyramid, the retention rate of the material learned through teaching others could be as high as 90 percent.

Likewise, cooperative learning also enhanced the low-achievers' language learning displayed in their writing skill. The low achievers in the control group did not score significantly better than those in the experimental group in the writing skill. In other words, both the high- and low-achievers in the experimental group outperformed their counterparts in the control group significantly in writing skill.

The cooperative learning context did not only benefit the low-achievers, it also helped the high-achieving students to explore language learning beyond the limitation of their textbooks. Those high-achievers were encouraged to read English texts and construct meaning & improve their vocabulary. They were given plenty of opportunities to explain their ideas to their teammates and to lead the discussions. As the Learning Pyramid suggested, the retention rate of the material learned could be enhanced if students were able to teach others.

The improvement of both high- and low-achievers in the experimental group could best be explained from Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development, Krashen's (1985) i+1 input hypothesis, Bandura's (1971) social learning theory, and the Constructivism (Yager, 1991). According to Vygotsky (1978), all good learning was that which is in advance of development and involved the acquisition of skills just beyond the student's grasp. Such learning occurred through interaction within the student's *zone of proximal development*. Vygotsky defined the *zone of proximal development* as the discrepancy between the student's actual developmental level (i.e., independent achievement) and his/her potential level (achievement with help from a more competent partner). From the frequent interaction with their peers, the high- and low-achievers in the experimental group were able to fully develop their potential and thus move beyond their current development to the so-called *i*+1 (Krashen, 1985). According to Krashen (1985), language acquisition took place during human interaction in an environment of the foreign language when the learner received language input that was one step beyond his/her current stage of linguistic competence (Krashen, 1985). Taken together, both Krashen's *'i+1'* and Vygotsky's zone of proximal development could hardly be achieved without the help of peer interaction and cooperation.

Furthermore, the high and low achievers were able to progress at their own pace because, in Bandura's view, the acquisition of complex skills and abilities depended not only on the processes of attention, retention, motor reproduction, and motivation, but also on the learners' sense of self-efficacy and the learners' self-regulatory system. Immanuel Kant (Yager, 1991) further elaborated this idea by asserting that human beings were not passive recipients of information (Yager, 1991). Learners actively constructed knowledge, connected it to previously assimilated knowledge, and made it theirs by constructing their own interpretation (Brooks & Brooks, 1999; Cheek)

According to Vygotsky (1978), an essential feature of learning was that it awakened a variety of internal developmental processes that were able to operate only when the learner was in the action of interacting with people in his or her environment and in cooperation with his or her peers. Therefore, when it came to language learning, the authenticity of the environment and the affinity between its participants were essential elements to make the learner feel part of this environment.

Unfortunately, these elements were rarely present in traditional classrooms. The basic premise of this theory was that development was social and knowledge was constructed by interaction of individuals with others and learning was the internalization of that social interaction The students in the control group, without much opportunity to interact with their peers, tended to be limited in their language development, especially the low achievers who were easily neglected in a traditional classroom. Without such an interactive context,

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

the zone of proximal development in both the high and low achievers in the control group was not fully developed.

Finally, regarding the students' attitudes questionnaire though the majority of the responses showed positive attitude towards cooperative learning.

In relation to previous studies, Alhaidari (2006) reported in his work that subjects who carried out reading tasks cooperatively showed positive attitude towards this technique. Also, Atsuta (2003) carried out a study to improve unsuccessful learners' motivation where he incorporated cooperative learning as one of the many motivational strategies employed to achieve the intended goal.

The findings of Atsuta showed the many advantages of CLL. These include making students more responsible of their learning, achieving high level of motivation, and allowing students in a mix-ability environment to help one another and thus promoting the learning process. Based on what is stated above, it is obvious that learners' responded positively to cooperative language learning in promoting reading and writing skills. In response to the fourth question, the study revealed that subjects undergoing the treatment of cooperative learning in second year were motivated to learn the target language. The implementation of cooperative learning in Sudanese EFL second year students seems to have motivated the participants to practice the English language.

13. Conclusions

Based on the results of the present study, several theoretical and pedagogical implications are provided.

13.1 Theoretical Implication

This study empirically illuminated the important aspect of interaction among learners. This may encourage language teachers to consider the incorporation of new teaching approaches, such as, cooperative language learning. With such innovative technique, teachers can provide an ongoing interactive environment to their various English language courses. Nevertheless, integrating reading with writing or other language skills via cooperative learning is highly recommended if we seek to overcome the weaknesses of Sudanese EFL learners in writing skill.

In short, university of Khartoum as esteem and a leading university in Sudan can adopt a new system of educational reform with restricted policy of teaching mainly focus in collaborative learning. This new reform is recommended to be applied gradually in the university.

13.2 Pedagogical Implications

First, using cooperative language learning in tertiary level had a positive impact on subjects' performance in reading comprehension and writing skill. Students benefiting much from cooperative language learning in many ways especially in mastering English language.

Second, the results of this research shed light on the effectiveness of cooperative learning as a successful classroom strategy which grounded in a scientific research base and the possibility of applying it in all levels of education with different subject areas.

Third, results of the current study also come out with a very important aspect in language teaching that cooperative learning boosts academic achievement for all students

although, the study has proven that, the high achiever students have benefited much and gain most than their counterparts (the low achievers) in cooperative learning. Consequently, CL develops communication and interpersonal relationship and that is the goal of education otherwise.

Fourth, 82.63% of students participated in this study have showed positive attitude towards this new innovative strategy. Students accepted cooperative language learning as a means of learning and improving English proficiency.

REFERENCES:

Astin, A. W. (1991). What really matters in general education: Provocative findings from a national study of student outcomes? Association of Liberal and General Studies.

Alhaidari, M. S. (2006). The effectiveness of using cooperative learning to promote reading comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency achievement scores of male fourth- and fifth-grade students in a Saudi Arabian school. PhD thesis, the Pennsylvania State University

Assalahi (2013), Why Is the Grammar-translation Method Still Alive in the Arab World? Teachers' Beliefs and Its implications for EFL Teacher Education

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college Implications for cooperative learning of a new national study? Cooperative Learning and College Teaching, 3(3), 2–8

Atkins, J. (2010). Creating Collaboration. English Journal, 99(5), 12-13

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* New York, NY: General Learning Press

Bromley, K. & Modlo, M. (1997). Using cooperative learning to improve reading and writing in language arts. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 13*(1), 21–35.

Cohen, L (1994). Designing Groupwork: strategies for the Heterogeneous Classroo,2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press

Edward & Chard, 2000 Engaging Children's Minds: The Project Approach. Second Edition.

Gillies, R. (2007). Cooperative learning: Integrating theory and practice. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Grabe, W. and Kaplan, R.B.. 1996. Theory and Practice of Writing. New York: Longman.

Gillies, R. M., & Ashman, A. F. (2000). The Effects of Cooperative Learning on Students with Learning Difficulties in the Lower Elementary School. *Journal of Special Education, 34*(1), 19-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002246690003400102

Harmer, J. 2006. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. England: Pearson Education Limited

Honnert and Bozan, 2005 Summary Frames: Language Acquisition for Special Education and ELL Students.

Hoye, 1989, Karnes,1990: Effects of Teaching Summary Writing to English Majors.

Johnson DXV. & Johnson, R. (1989a). Cooperation and competition: Theory and research. Edina, MN: interaction Book Company.

Javid, Farooq, and Gulzar (2012), The Role of Art-Integrated Input: Implementing Arts to Maximise English Proficiency among Saudi English-Major Undergraduates

Johnson, D., R. & Holubec, E., (1993). Circles of learning (4th ed.), Edina, MN: International Book Company

Jones, E.M. & Carrasquillo, A.L. 1998. Developing English writing proficiency in limited English proficient college students through cooperative language strategies*. ERIC Document Reproduction No ED 423 668*

Johnson, K. 2001. Some views of language and language learning. *An introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching.* Harlow: Pearson Educational Ltd

Johnson & Johnson, 2002 Cooperative Learning and Social Interdependence Theory.

Jones, E.M. & Carrasquillo, A.L. 1998. Developing English writing proficiency in limited English proficient college students through cooperative language strategies*. ERIC Document Reproduction No ED 423 668*

Kagan, S. (1994). Cooperative learning. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Kessler, C. (1992). Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Slavin, R., (1978). Student Teamstand Achievement Divisions, Journal of research and development in education, 12, PP. 39-49.

Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis. New York, NY: Pergamon.

Kirkland M. R & Saunders, M.A (1991), Maximizing students' performance in summary writing: managing cognitive load TESOL Quarterly 25(1), 105-121)

Law, Y. K. (2011). The effects of cooperative learning on enhancing Hong-Kong fifth graders' achievement goals, autonomous motivation and reading proficiency. *Journal of Research in Reading, 34*(4), 402-425.

Liao, H. C., & Oescher, J. (2009). Does cooperative learning really enhance self-efficacy and task value of English grammar learners? *Journal of Education and Psychology, 32*(3), 24-54.

Leal, D. J. (1993). The power of literary peer-group discussions: How children collaboratively negotiate meaning. *The Reading Teacher, 47*(2), 114-120.

Nunan, D.1991. *Language Teaching Methodology*. London: Prentice Hall

Mariam Mohamed Nor and Napisah Kepol. 2005. The use of cooperative tasks in ESL composition by form one ESL writing students. *Teaching and Learning of English in a Second Language*. Tanjung Malim: Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris

McGroarty, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D.D. Holt (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: A response to linguistic and cultural diversity* (pp. 19-46). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta systems

Langer and Applebee, 1987, How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning. NCTE Research Report No. 22.

Rashed Alghamdi1 & Robyn Gillies,(2013) The Impact of Cooperative Learning in Comparison to Traditional Learning (Small Groups) on EFL Learners' Outcomes When Learning English as a Foreign Language.

Spencer, E. 1983. *Writing Matters Across the Curriculum*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Stevens, R. J. (2003). Student team reading and writing: A cooperative learning approach to middle school literacy instruction. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 9*(20), 136-160.

Slavin, R. E. (1995). Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sittilert, W. (1994). *Effects of cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC) on English reading comprehension and opinions about classroom atmosphere of mathayomsuksa five students.* M.A. Dissertation, Chiangmai University

Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. *Mind in Society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Veenman, S., Kenter, B. and Post, K. (2000) Cooperative Learning in Dutch Primary Schools

Veenman, S., Kenter, B., & Post, K. (2000). Cooperative learning in Dutch primary classrooms. Educational Studies, 26(3), 281–302.

Wong S. (1981) Summary writing: principles and practice Singapore Pan Pacific.

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

Appendix A

Students' Performance

Pre & Post - Test Results Group B

Reading (Experimental Group)

Student	Pretest Percentage Score	Posttest Percentage Score	Growth from Pretest to Posttest
Student A	40 %	68%	28 %
Student B	60 %	81%	21 %
Student C	50 %	73%	23 %
Student D	60 %	79%	19 %
Student E	50 %	72 %	22%
Student F	75 %	95%	20 %
Student G	70 %	89%	19 %
Student H	50 %	70 %	20 %
Student I	45 %	90 %	45%
Student J	51 %	70%	19 %
Student K	30 %	70%	40 %
Student L	10 %	61%	51 %
Student M	60 %	81%	21 %
Student N	70 %	90%	20 %
Student O	50 %	68%	18 %
Student P	55 %	73%	18 %
Student Q	30 %	80%	50 %
Student R	60 %	97%	37 %
Student S	50 %	74%	24 %
Student T	40 %	84%	44 %
Student U	50 %	96%	46 %
Student W	60 %	92%	32 %

Pre & Post- Test Results Group A

Reading (Control Group)

Student	Pretest Percentage Score	Posttest Percentage Score	Growth from Pretest to Posttest
Student a	60 %	67 %	7%
Student b	40%	61 %	21%
Student c	70%	77 %	7%
Student d	40%	55 %	15%
Student e	50%	51 %	1%
Student f	30%	24%	6%-
Student g	40%	26%	14%-
Student h	70%	88%	18%
Student i	80%	82%	2%
Student j	60%	58%	2%-
Student k	60%	43%	17%-
Student l	70%	73%	3%
Student m	50%	65%	15%
Student n	80%	76%	6%-
Student o	70%	46%	14%-
Student p	60%	69%	9%
Student q	70%	67%	3%-
Student r	50%	40%	10%-
Student s	70%	83%	13%
Student t	90%	83%	7%-
Student u	24 %	20%	4%-

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

Pre & Post - Test Results Group A

Writing (Experimental Group)

Student	Pretest Percentage Score	Posttest Percentage Score	Growth from Pretest to Posttest
Student a	40%	70%	30%
Student b	10 %	40%	30%
Student c	45%	75%	30%
Student d	15 %	47%	32%
Student e	50%	75%	25%
Student f	10%	48%	38%
Student g	35%	70%	35%
Student h	54%	84%	30%
Student i	60%	94%	34%
Student j	41%	72%	31%
Student k	32 %	61%	29%
Student l	47 %	90%	43%
Student m	29%	61%	32%
Student n	38%	74%	36%
Student o	55 %	83%	38%
Student p	48 %	70%	22%
Student q	49%	87%	38%
Student r	52%	82%	30%
Student s	35%	78%	43%
Student t	36%	71%	35%
Student u	29%	62%	33%

Pre & Post - Test Results Group B

Writing (Control Group)

Student	Pretest Percentage Score	Posttest Percentage Score	Growth from Pretest to Posttest
Student A	24%	20 %	4 %-
Student B	60%	71 %	11%
Student C	34%	50%	16%
Student D	33%	42%	9%
Student E	66 %	84%	22%
Student F	39%	78%	39%
Student G	26%	60%	34%
Student H	32 %	65%	33%
Student I	27 %	53%	26%
Student J	44%	77%	33%
Student K	31%	40%	9%
Student L	26%	46%	20%
Student M	41%	70%	29%
Student N	60%	59 %	1 %-
Student O	35%	44%	9%
Student P	35%	56%	21%
Student Q	30%	43%	13%
Student R	60%	52 %	8%-
Student S	42%	38%	4%-
Student T	68%	62 %	6%-
Student U	39%	43%	4%
Student W	48%	65%	17%

Volume: 4 Issue: 2

Appendix (B)

Table (8.4.1)

Students' Attitudes Towards Cooperative Learning in the English Classrooms

***SA**= strongly agree, **A**= agree, N= neutral, D= disagree, **SD**= strongly disagree*

Rank	The statements	SA	A	N	D	SD	*Mean*	*St.D*
		No.	*No.*	*No.*	*No.*	*No.*		
1	1. Cooperative Learning is an effective way to promote reading comprehension.	20	5	1	1	0	4.6296	.74152
9	2. In cooperative Learning, students allotted sufficient time for reading English texts.	10	13	2	2	0	4.1481	.86397
18	3. Students' anxiety and shyness are reduced when using C L .	10	7	4	3	3	3.6667	1.38675
3	4. In Cooperative Learning, students can help each other in areas of learning where they are weak.	15	10	1	1	0	4.4444	.75107
2	5. Cooperative Learning makes learning interesting and useful for students.	18	8	0	1	0	4.5556	.75107
4	6. Cooperative Learning encourages students to act as resources of information for each other.	12	13	1	1	0	4.3333	.73380
6	7. Cooperative Learning increases students' talking time a way that helps them develop their interpersonal skills.	11	13	2	1	0	4.2593	.76423
8	8. In cooperative learning the correction or the feedback comes immediately during learning process	10	12	5	0	0	4.1852	.73574
15	9.Correction from peers in cooperative classroom seen as help rather than judgment	5	16	5	1	0	3.9259	.72991
9	10. Cooperative Learning develops students' writing skills.	15	5	3	4	0	4.1481	1.13353
11	11. Cooperative Learning makes a student to be as critical thinker about the ideas presented by a classmate or others.	9	13	3	2	0	4.0741	.87380
7	12.C L enable students to proof their ideas or explain their views about certain topics of writing in a way that develop their English writing	9	15	3	0	0	4.2222	.64051
7	13. C L is interesting because teachers inspire students instead of teaching them.	15	5	6	1	0	4.2222	1.05003
5	14. In cooperative Learning, students work without the control of the teacher and the pressure of	11	13	3	0	0	4.2963	.66880

	the whole class.							
12	15. C L encourages students to enhance their performance and develop their progress.	9	11	6	1	0	4.0370	.85402
12	16. C L motivates low- achiever students to learn more challenging concepts by interacting with their classmates.	10	11	3	3	0	4.0370	.97985
6	17.In CL, students get repetitive information from different sources a way that reinforces their understanding	12	11	3	1	0	4.2593	.81300
5	18.CL is an effective tool of teaching and learning which integrated the four kills of English language	12	12	2	1	0	4.2963	.77533
13	19. Cooperative learning is Not used by many university teachers.	9	13	2	2	1	4.0000	1.03775
14	20. C L makes students more kinesthetic because they are in charge of doing everything.	7	14	5	0	1	3.9630	.89792
11	21. The interaction that learners have when working cooperatively builds interpersonal relationships among students.	9	14	1	3	0	4.0741	.91676
17	22.CooperativeLearning groups provides students with greater priority in managing and controlling their learning.	4	16	3	3	1	3.7037	.99285
16	23. Cooperative Learning develops students' individual accountability where they are responsible of their own learning..	6	15	2	1	3	3.7407	1.19591
10	24. In cooperative Learning, students are enthusiastic because they are encouraged to investigate information by themselves.	10	12	4	0	1	4.1111	.93370
10	25.In cooperative Learning, students learn how to teach one another and explain the material in their own words.	9	14	2	2	0	4.1111	.84732
11	26. In cooperative Learning, students switch roles during tasks or projects, away that develop their leadership and team work abilities	9	13	3	2	0	4.0741	.87380
12	27.Cooperative Learning develops students' positive interdependence.	9	14	2	0	2	4.0370	1.05544